DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 440 SO 014 275

TITLE	Summer Institute for Educational Research on Asian Americans. Final Performance Report (February 1, 1980-October 31, 1980).
INSTITUTION	Berkeley Unified School District, Calif. Asian American Bilingual Center.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC. Minorities and Women's Programs.
PUB DATE	31 Oct 80
GRANT	NIE-G-79-0010
NOTE	52p.; For a related document, see SO 014 274. Appendix A may not reproduce clearly due to small print type.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Asian Americans; Bilingual Education; Communications; Course Descriptions; *Educational Research; *Institutes (Training Programs); Internship Programs; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Research Methodology; Research Skills; Skill Development; *Summer Programs

ABSTRACT

This performance report of the Summer Institute for Educational Research on Asian Americans summarizes and evaluates the activities and tasks completed from February 1 through October 31, 1980. The goal of the project was to increase the participation of Asian Americans in the field of educational research and development. Specifically, the project sought to enlarge the informal network established by the 1979 summer institute participants, to create a forum for the exchange of knowledge and the discussion of challenging problems, and to increase the research skills of participants. Fifty Asian Americans participated in the institute. Four courses were conducted: qualitative/quantitative methods in educational research; research on bilingual education; quantitative methods in policy analysis; and language research in education. In addition to the courses, special guests and participants gave presentations and a grantsmanship workshop was held. An internship program placed participants in educational research and development organizations to gain practical experience. Evaluation data were collected through questionnaires. In general, all participants felt that the institute was well organized and the experience worthwhile. The objectives were accomplished. The appendices contain a participant list and the complete evaluation report. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ASIAN AMERICAN BILINGUAL CENTER
BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1414 WALNUT STREET, ROOM 9
BERKELEY, CA 94709 (415) 848-3199

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED221440

SUMMER INSTITUTE

FOR

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ON ASIAN AMERICANS

Final Performance Report

February 1, 1980 - October 31, 1980

SØ 014275

G-79-0010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Description 2

Conclusion 11

Appendices

A 12

B 16

1980 SI Final Performance Report

INTRODUCTION

This is the final performance report of the project,"1980 Summer Institute for Educational Research on Asian Americans." The goal of the project was to increase the participation of Asian Americans in the field of educational research and development (educational R & D). Specifically, the project sought to enlarge the informal network established by the 1979 Summer Institute participants, to create a forum for the exchange of knowledge and the discussion of challenging problems, and to increase the research skills of participants.

The project was funded from November 1, 1979 through October 31, 1980. The activities conducted between November 1, 1979 through January 31, 1980 were summarized in the last progress report. This final report will summarize the activities and tasks completed from February 1 through October 31, 1980.

DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES

An information and application brochure was prepared. Two thousand copies were distributed by February 15 based on the project mailing list. The application deadline was set at March 31, 1980.

The project steadily received inquiries from people who read about it in news releases. Another two hundred brochures were sent out to these people from February to May 1980.

Selection of Participants

All together, approximately seventy complete applications were received. The project director met with two other educational researchers, Dr. Kenyon Chan of the Univeristy of California, Los Angeles, and Dr. Bob Suzuki of the University of Massachusetts, during the Annual Conference of the National Association of Asian and Pacific Americans in April. The three selected fifty participants for the Institute. Seven received travel grants, eight received living stipends and fifteen received both travel grants and living stipends.

Courses and Lectures

Four courses were planned for the 1980 Summer Institute. They were 1) qualitative/quantitative methods in educational research, 2) research on bilingual education, 3) quantitative methods in policy analysis, and 4) language research in education.

Qualitative/quantitative methods in educational research. This course was taught by Dr. Harold Levine of the University of California, Los Angeles.

The course was designed to introduce participants to the basic conceptual and practical issues involved in naturalistic research. Epistemological and methodological assumptions which underlie naturalistic research, typical features of design, and principles which govern data reduction and analysis were discussed. Through both lecture and in-class exercises, participants were introduced to basic skills in participant-observation research, such as observational and recording strategies, data storage and retrieval, and interviewing.

The course also devoted time to quantitative approaches in naturalistic research. Substantive problems within which some of the methodological considerations were illustrated came from the instructors' own research in Papua, New Guinea, and on mentally retarded school children in the Los Angeles area, and from other sources.

Two guest lecturers delivered presentations during the course. Dr. Karen Watson-Gegio, Associate Professor at Harvard University, gave the lecture "From Observation to Interpretation: The Emergent Nature of Ethnographic Fieldwork." Dr. Stuart Berde, Assistant Professor at the University of Massachusetts, Boston conducted a seminar on how to collect data from interviews.

This was the most popular course at the Summer Institute and was attended by over twenty people.

Research on bilingual education. This course was team taught by Dr. Kenyon Chan of the University of California, Los Angeles; Dr. Ruby Takanishi of the Bank Street College of Education, New York; Dr. Luis Ortiz-Franco of the National Institute of Education; and the project director.

This course was designed to familiarize the participants with current research literature on bilingual education. Fifteen research studies related to Asian American bilingual education were introduced to the participants during each seminar; each team of two to three participants was assigned two studies. The tems prepared annotations on the studies and presented the studies to the class. Lecturers led the critique of the studies, interpreted the findings, and suggested alternative research methods and further studies. Various research issues were selected for in-depth discussion as they appeared in the studies reviewed. This course was attended by approximately fifteen participants. Towards the end of the course, participants again divided into small groups of two to four and designed research studies of their own. These were also presented to the class for critique.

Quantitative methods in policy analysis. This course was first going to be taught by Dr. Charles Benson of the University of California, Berkeley. However, Dr. Benson was appointed to the Commission on School Finance and had to resign the lectureship because of conflict of interest. Instead, the course was conducted by a team consisting of Dr. Federico Macaranas of Manhattan College, Bronx, Dr. Setsuko Nishi of Brooklyn College, Brooklyn; and Dr. William Liu of the University of Illinois, Chicago Circle.

This course explored research topics on policy matters affecting the education of Asian Americans. Participants investigated educational issues

with quantitative tools of analysis, particularly in the fields of equity theory. Special emphasis was placed on the social structure linkages to education (home and work environment) as these pertain to Asian Americans. The course was divided into three parts. Part I was taught by Dr. William Liu and was on the relationship of family and educational equity. Part II was taught by Dr. Federico Macaranas and was on government policy and educational equity. Part III of the course was taught by Dr. Setsuko Nishi. She presented theories toward educational equity for Asian Americans.

Dr. Federico Macaranas also presented two lectures, one entitled "A Critique of Social Indicators of Equality," the other entitled "Issues in the Theory of Educational Opportunity and Its Measurement."

Language research in education

Dr. Heidi Dulay of Bloomsbury West was originally slated to handle this course. However, because of previous conflicts with the Berkeley Unified School District, her contract was not approved. A team of lecturers was gathered to share the responsibilities of the class. They were, Dr. Mae Chu-Chang of the National Institute of Education, Dr. Rosita Galang of the University of San Francisco, and Dr. Donaldo Macedo of Boston University.

This course introduced the participants to theories and recent researches on first and second language acquisiton. Issues, misconceptions, and research on mother-tongue maintenance for language minority children were discussed. It further went into relationships between reading and oral language development.

Dr. Bruce Fraser and Dr. Maria Brisk of Boston University were guest lecturers. They presented topics on second language acquisition characteristics in terms of interlanguage hypothesis, the effects of interference, and neurological, psychological, cognitive and sociological factors on the order, rate and success of acquisition. Proposals for investigating the acquisition of functional rather than grammatical competence was also proposed and discussed.

This course was organized because of the large number of participants in a similar course at the 1979 Institute. However, only four participants were enrolled in the course this year.

Other Presentations

In addition to the lecturers and seminars, special guests and participants gave presentations at the coffee hour from 8:30 to 10:00 each morning.

Gladys K. Hardy: Opportunities for Educational Researchers in the Federal Government.

John Wu: Adult Education and Working in Washington, D.C.

Jean Kim, Mia Yee, Pat Blinde, Gayle Yamasaki: Roles of Asian American Women in Educational Research.

Christine Lim, Elizabeth Kumimoto, Kathy Au, Amy Agbayani, and Glenn Hirata: Education in Hawaii.

Mae Chu-Chang: Funding Opportunities at the National Institute of Education.

Akemi Kikumura: Media in Education.

Grantsmanship Workshop

To simplify the recruitment effort and take advantage of the gathering of the participants, the National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education (NAAPAE) organized a grantsmanship workshop for the Summer Institute participants. This workshop was well attended. Detailed proceedings of this workshop were submitted by NAAPAE to NIE in a separate report and will not be reported on here.

Facilities

Boston University cooperated fully with the Summer Institute. Dean Paul Warren of the School of Education hosted, making available to the project and its participants classroom facilities, library privileges, recreational facilities, and emergency health care services. The Boston University Bilingual Education Resource Center also supported the Summer Institute by providing office space, telephones, and secretarial services. Dr. Donaldo Macedo of the Boston Resource Center served as the Boston Coordinator of the project and made classroom and dormitory arrangements.

Because the Institute was held in July when temperatures easily reach 100° F, the Institute arranged for air-conditioned dormitories and classrooms. However, the week before the Institute, the housing office of Boston University informed the project that the dormitory originally reserved was full, and that all the participants had to move to another dormitory which did not have air-conditioning.

The Summer Institute was not able to inform all participants of the last-minute move, resulting in many logistical problems during registration.

The classrooms reserved had air-conditioning facilities which were not turned on because of the University policy of energy conservation during the summer months. The summer heat did disrupt some of the class activities.

Participants

There were forty participants in the 1980 Summer Institute at Boston. Participants are broken down into categories in the evaluation report reproduced in the appendix. Of the participants, only one attended the previous Institute. A large number of participants were from the East Coast, satisfying a major objective for conducting the Institute in Boston. A roster of the participants, their addresses and research interests is reproduced in the appendix.

Internship Program

The internship program was aimed at placing participants in educational R & D organizations to gain practical experience. Interns worked at these R & D organizations for six weeks and received living stipends from the Summer Institute.

In contrast to last year, few participants were interested in and applied for the internship program. Of those who applied, only three were actually placed. The difference in interest level was probably due to the fact that more post-doctorates with jobs participated this year, and they were not interested in any short-term internship program. Another reason was the meager stipend ($30/day) offered to the intern, which is not enough to support an intern working in an organization outside his/her hometown.

Of the three interns, Mr. Glenn Hirata was placed with the Kamehameha Early Education Project (KEEP) in Honolulu, Dr. Jerry Huang and Mr. Mark Chow were placed with ARC Associates, Inc., Oakland.

During his internship at KEEP, Mr. Hirata worked with Dr. Griselle Spidel on the analysis of a "cognitive-functioning" task performed by Hawaiian children. He also prepared, under the supervision of Dr. Tom Klein, an evaluation design for the College Opportunities Program at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. Upon completion of the internship program, Mr. Hirata was retained as a research assistant with KEEP.

Dr. Huang joined ARC Associates on the ongoing study, "Bilingual Education in Chinese Communities," funded by NIE. During his internship, Dr. Huang participated in meetings on the design of the study and developed various student and parent questionnaires for data collection on attitudes of Chinese communities toward bilingual education.

Mr. Chow's internship at ARC Associates was on project development. During the six-week program, Mr. Chow worked with other researchers on the development of proposals. Mr. Chow completed a proposal on the development of an educational film. This proposal was later submitted by Mr. Chow to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Evaluation

The evaluation of the 1980 Summer Institute was designed to: (1) gather information on the merits of the project; (2) gather information useful to the planning of the 1981 Summer Institute in Hawaii; and (3) investigate possibilities for seeking possible long-term direction and future roles of the Institute.

The evaluation was conducted by three volunteer Summer Institute participants: Amefil Agbayani, who will play a major role in organizing the 1981 Summer Institute in Hawaii; Mark Chow, coordinator of the 1980 Summer Institute; and Patricia Yee, who was using this evaluation project to satisfy a course requirement at the University of Southern California.

Data was collected three times. A questionnaire was distributed to all participants on the first day of the Institute asking about their expectations. Another questionnaire was administered to all participants on the last day asking about their experiences at the Institute. Additional information was gathered during a discussion session on the same day.

In general, all participants felt that the Institute was well organized and the experience worthwhile. Comments were received about the tight schedules, the heat, and the accomodations. The team teaching arrangement of some courses, especially when there were no lecturers staying with the students for the duration of the Institute, received negative comments.

The complete evaluation report is reproduced in the appendix.

Conclusion

The 1980 Summer Institute was a success and satisfied its three major objectives: (1) to enlarge the informal network established by the 1979 Summer Institute participants; (2) to create a forum for the exchange of ideas; and (3) to increase the research skills of participants.

The increased number of applicants and participants this year indicated the growth of the project. Many of the participants indicated that they found out about the Institute through past participants. All indicated that they would tell others about the 1981 Institute in Hawaii and encourage these people to apply.

The internship program was somewhat disappointing because of the small number of applicants. Although the three who participated indicated that they gained much from the experience and they would recommend the program to others.

To evaluate the full impact of this project and the Minorities and Women's Program, a longitudinal study is necessary. Participants should be tracked at least five years to assess their gains due to their participation in the project.

APPENDIX A

Roster of SI Participants

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PARTICIPANT	EDUCATION /	EMPLOYMENT /	RESEARCH INTERESTS
Prof. Amefil R. Agbayani 3432-B-2 Kalihi St. Honolulu, HI 96819 (808) 845-6842 home (808) 948-7348 work	Ph.D, political science Univ. of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii	Asst. Prof. and Director Operation Manong College of Education Univ. of Hawaii	Ethnic studies, cross-cultural education
Prof. Danilo T. Begonia 335 Moncada Way San Francisco, CA 94127 (415) 333-2593 home (415) 863-2504 work	Ph.D candidate bilingual/bicultural ed. Stanford Univ. Stanford, CA	Asst. Prof, Asian Studies San Francisco State (on leave)	Psychology of bilingualism
Dr. Gertrudes A. Bersola 607 Travis Blvd. Fairfield, CA 94533 (707) 426-0109 home (707) 422-6073 work	Doctorate, humanology and vitology State Univ. of the Philippines	Instructor, F-S adult school	Socio-psycho linguistics
Dr. Rosita A.P. Biron 544 S. Taylor Oak Park, IL 60304 (312) 383-8971 home (312) 996-5627 work	Doctor of Education Centro Escolar Univ Manila, Philippines	Asst. Prof of Education Univ. of Illinois Chicago, IL	Multi-cultural curriculum Asian mental health programs
Mr. Hui-Ming (Bill) Chang PO Box 1025 Stillwater, OK 74074 (405) 377-3139 home (405) 372-1999 work	Ed.D candidate Reading Education Oklahoma State Univ. Stillwater , OK		educational research and statistics
Ms Carolyn M. Fong 4465 Pinon St. Concord, CA 94521 (415) 825-0205	Masters in Nursing, R.N. Pediatric Specialization Univ. of Calif. San Francisco, CA	Instructor, pediatrics Merritt College Oakland, CA	Asian adolescent health issues
Prof. Nelson C. Fong Box 91 Sinclair, ME 04779 (207) 543-6269 home (207) 764-0311 work	Ph.D, statistics and measurement Univ. of Nebraska	Assoc. Professor Univ. of Maine Presque Isle, ME	educational measurement
Ms. Yoshimi M. Harsel 6536 27th Ave. Seattle , WA 98115 (206) 522-1848	Ph.D candidate school of Education Univ. of Washington Educational Psychology		educational research, psychometrics
Ms Mary A. Haskins Box 2478 CS Pullman, WA 99163 (509) 332-2327 home (509) 335-4511 work	Ph.D candidate Counseling Psychology Washington State Univ. Pullman, WA	Counseling Asst. Student counseling center Washington State Univ. Pullman, WA	self concepts and assertiveness in Asian Americans
Mr Glenn T. Hirata 2585 Dole St. B-120 Hale Noelani Honolulu, HA 96822 (808) 948-8124 work	M.Ed in Educational Psychology Univ. of Hawaii Honolulu, HA	Graduate Assistant College Opportunities Prog.	Psycho-social development social cognition research methodology
Dr. Dick K. Hsieh 1519 Lindale Circle Norman, OK 73069 (405) 364-3222 home (405) 325-3806 work	Ph.D in Secondary Administration and Curriculum University of Oklahoma	Program Coordinator Special Student Concerns Project Oklahoma City, OK	educational research on Asian Americans
Dr. Grace Oon Bee Hsu 1035 W. Main Galesburg, IL 61401 (309) 343-2388 home (309) 343-0112 work	Ph.D in Curriculum and Instruction in Education Univ. of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI	Asst. Prof of Education Knox College Galesburg, IL	multicultural and bilingual education
Ms Carol R. Iu 1826 Federal Ave. #3 Los Angeles, CA 90025 (213) 473-3704 home (213) 825-2974 work	DSW candidate Univ. of Calif. Los Angeles, CA	Research Assoc. Asian American Studies Center UCLA Los Angeles, CA	Indo-Chinese program development, women in China
Ms Yvonne Chan 6843 Robio Ave. Van Nuys, CA 91406 (213) 994-7216 home (213) 342-0413 work	Ph.D candidate Special Education UCLA Los Angeles, CA	Special Education Resource advisor Los Angeles Unified School District	special education and exceptional children, multi- cultural studies

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PARTICIPANT	EDUCATION /	EMPLOYMENT /	RESEARCH INTERESTS
Dr. Jerry Chin-Li Huang 12 Irene Lane, North Plainview, N.Y. 11803 (516) 931-4627 home (212) 673-8896 work	Ed.D in counseling, guidance and student personnel Univ. of Rochester Rochester, N.Y.	Bilingual Guidance counselor Seward Park High School New York, N.Y.	cross-cultural studies
Ms Kristina Inn 2413 Round Top Drive Honolulu, HA 96822 (808) 949-1212 home (808) 947-3366 work	MA in anthropology Univ. of Hawaii Manoa, HA	Curriculum Developer Hawaii State Multicultural Awareness Project Univ. of Hawaii	educational research curriculum development
Mr. Henry Jung 81 Westland Ave. Boston, MA 02115 (617) 266-7986 home (617) 267-6744 work	Ph.D candidate in counseling psychology Univ. of Massachusetts Amherst, MA	Bilingual career and financial counselor Talent Search Program Boston, MA	research in social issues, community service, violence in Asian Americans
Dr. Jitendra M. Kapoor 4325 Springwood Trail Indianapolis, IN 46208 (317) 293-2325 home (317) 264-7263 work	Ph.D in social work Lucknow Univ., India Post-doc research Dept of Communication Michigan State Univ.	Assoc. Prof. Indiana Univ. School of Social Work Indianapolis, IN	curriculum development and resource material development
Ms Jean Kim 44 Thorndyke St Springfield, MA 01118 (413) 733-5257 home (413) 545-0333 work	Ph.D candidate in counseling psychology Univ. of Massachusetts Amherst, MA	Asst. Director Student Dev. and Counseling Center Univ. of Massachusetts	Asian American identity development
Dr. Akemi Kikumura 5127 San Feliciano Dr. Woodland Hills, CA 91364 (213) 346-6584 home	Ph.D in anthropology University of California Los Angeles, CA	Instructor, Lecturer, Asian American Studies University of Southern California Los Angeles, CA	Japanese acculturation, ethnic families
Mr. Peter C.Y. Leung Asian American Studies Dept. University of Calif., Davis Davis, CA 95616 (916) 758-0568 home (916) 752-2356 work	MS in environmental horitculture Univ. of Calif. Davis Diploma of Education Northcote Education College Hong Kong	Director, Asian Studies Program Univ. of Calif. Davis	Cantonese instructional curriculum development
Ms Daisy T. Lu 5015 S. Ferdinand St. Seattle WA 98118 (206) 725-7949 home (503) 248-6813 work	Ph.D candidate in reading and language arts	Curriculum Specialist Northwest Regional Educational Lab Portland, Oregon	reading curriculum
Mr Eiji Muraki 1369 E. Hyde Park Blvd. #1010 Chicago, IL 60615 (312) 493-9020 home (312) 977-2536 work	Ph.D candidate in educational measurement evaluation and statistics Univ. of Chicago Chicago, IL		bilingual education evaluation
Dr. James K. Okutsu Asian American Studies San Francisco State Univ 1600 Holloway Ave. San Francisco, CA 94132 (415) 469-1064	JD from Univ of Calif. Hastings College of Law San Francisco, CA	Lecturer Asian American Studies San Francisco State San Francisco, CA	historical, statistical and attitudinal studies on Asian Americans
Mr Paul M. Ong 2209 Jefferson #2 Berkeley, CA 94703 (415) 841-6512	Ph.D candidate in economics Univ. of California Berkeley, CA		statistical research on Asian Americans
Dr. Vijaya K. Samaraweera Austin 203 Harvard Law School Cambridge, MA 02138 (617) 729-0349 home (617) 495-3148 work	Ph.D from University of Oxford Oxford, England	Fellow in Law and History Harvard Law School Cambridge, MA	History and education in Sri Lanka and Ceylon
Mr Leslie Wong 5616 East 141st St. Puyallup, WA 98371 (206) 537-6181 home (206) 964-6581 work	MS in experimental psychology Eastern Washington University Cheney, WA	Consultant Asian American Alliance Tacoma, WA	Asian American mental health, ethnic student performance in community college

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PARTICIPANT	EDUCATION	EMPLOYMENT	RESEARCH INTERESTS
Ms Annie C. Tsang 13 Duncan St. Maldwick, NJ 07463 (201) 447-3220 home (212) 592-0883 work	Ph.D candidate Bilingual Education New York University New York, NY	teacher Bilingual Social Studies Newtown High School Queens, NY	academic achievement of Asian High School students
Dr. Edward T. Uyeno 535 Everett Palo Alto, CA 94301	Ph.D in Psychology and Statistics University of Toronto Toronto, Canada	Research Psychologist SRI International Menlo Park, CA	bilingual education and social behavior of Asian Americans
Dr. Dulzura N. Villaflor 4811 Rosewood Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90004 (213) 462-4925 home (213) 385-0905 work	Ed.D Univ. of Madrid Madrid, Spain	Director, Asian Pride Learning Center Los Angeles, CA	Asian children's programs, Filipino communications problems in the U.S.
Dr. Eugene F. Wong 1049 LaFonda Dr. #2 Las Cruces, NM 88001 (505) 522-1428 home	Ph.D in International Relations University of Denver Denver, CO		socio-historical imagery of Asian Americans in films and television
Ms Gayle S. Yamasaki 3724 11th NW Albuquerque, NM 87107 (505) 354-6771 home (505) 277-3917 work	Ph.D candidate Dept. of Counseling and Guidance Univ. of New Mexico	Asst. Coordinator Native American Studies Program Univ. of New Mexico	research in the psychology of counselor education
Ms Mia D. Yee Dept of Psych. Yale Univ. Box 11A, Yale Station New Haven, CT 06520 (203) 777-7490 home (203) 436-1592 work	Ph.D candidate Dept. of Psychology Yale University New Haven, CT		childhood socialization
Ms Patricia A. Yee 9591 Duke Dr. Westminster, CA 92683 (714) 531-8956 home (714) 821-7790 work	Ph.D candidate Educational Psychology Univ. of Southern California	Assoc. Member Southwest Regional Laboratory	program information systems, teacher training and program evaluation
Ms Sandra D. Yuen 2295 Columbia St. Palo Alto, CA 94306 (415) 326-5984 home (415) 941-9550 work	Ph.D candidate Early Education and Child Development School of Education Stanford University Stanford, CA		development of ethnic self-esteem in Chinese children
Ms Grace P. Yun 174 Davis St. Hamden, CT 06517 (203) 624-9367 home (203) 436-2646 work	Ph.D candidate Administration and Policy in Urban Education Fordham University New York, NY	Administrators Focused on Multicultural Ed. NYC Avisory Council	professional experiences of Asian American professors
Mr Gary F Yung 14575 SW Walker Rd. #4 Beaverton, OR 97055 (503) 646-0103 home (503) 248-6975 work	Ph.D candidate Ed. Curriculum and Instruction University of the Pacific Stockton, CA	Curriculum Dev, Specialist Center for Bilingual Ed. Northwest Regional Ed. Lab. Portland, OR	research in bilingual curriculum programs and evaluation
Dr. Elizabeth N. Kunimoto 1504 Uluhao St. Kailua, HI 96734 (808) 261-4285 home (808) 948-8715 work	Ph.D in Educational Psychology Univ. of Hawaii	Asst. Prof. of Communications Univ. of Hawaii at Manoa	communications competence and mental health
Dr Kathryn Au 1850 Makuakane St. Honolulu, HI 96817 (808) 842-8301 work	Ph.D in Educational Psychology Univ. of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, IL	Research Psychologist Educational specialist Kamehameha Early Education Program Honolulu, HI	reading research, home/school differences in language use
Dr Patricia L.Blinde 1130 Chelsea #8 Santa Monica , CA 90403 (213) 828-6679 home (213) 741-7934 work	Ph.D in Comparative Literature Univ of Southern California Los Angeles, CA	Executive Committee Women's Studies USC Los Angeles, CA	women and ethnicity, multi-ethnic literature

APPENDIX B

Evaluation Report

EVALUATION REPORT:

SECOND SUMMER INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

ON ASIAN AMERICANS

July 7 to 18, 1980

Evaluation Committee:
Amefil Agbayani
Mark Chow
Patricia Yee

Submitted by:
Patricia Yee

December, 1980

Introduction

The Second Summer Institute for Educational Research on Asian-Americans, held July 7 through 18, 1980, was sponsored by the Asian-American Bilingual Center, Berkeley Unified School District; hosted by the School of Education, Boston University; and supported by a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. The stated objective of the Institute was to encourage and increase participation of Asian-Americans in educational research. Specifically, the Institute sought to a) encourage the informal network of Asian-American educational researchers, b) create a forum for the exchange of knowledge and discussion of challenging problems, c) increase research skills, and d) develop grantsmanship skills among the participants.

A variety of activities were planned to attain these objectives. They consisted of:

1. A series of lectures and seminars in which educational research was approached from different perspectives: bilingual education, language research, ethnography, and quantitative methods in policy analysis;

2. A number of informal coffee hours in the mornings to give participants an opportunity to discuss issues with special guests;

3. A special intensive workshop in grantsmanship offered by the National Association for Asian- and Pacific-American Education (NAAPAE).

A full day of activities included a morning coffee hour at 8:30 and a two-hour seminar at 10:00; then after lunch another two-hour seminar was held, and a two-hour lecture at 3:00. The special grantsmanship workshops were on several weeknights and on weekends. A more

detailed description and schedule of these activities are included in Appendix A.

The number of participants varied somewhat as some arrived late and others had to leave early. However, there were approximately 39 participants, most were of Asian-American background, a few of Eurasian, and one of Asian-Mexican.

Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is threefold. One is to gather information to aid in reporting the results of this year's Institute to the funding agency. Second, it is the special intent of this evaluation to gather information for the planning of next year's Summer Institute which has been scheduled to take place in Hawaii. Finally, this evaluation seeks to gather information on the possible direction and future role of the Institute after next year.

Questions which guided the collection of data for each of the evaluation purposes are listed below. Of course, each of the questions may be considered under more than one evaluation purpose.

1. To aid in reporting to the funding agency:
   a. Were there any significant outcomes of the Institute?
   b. If so, what were they?
   c. If not, what might the problems have been?
2. To aid in next year's Institute planning:
   a. Were the goals of the Institute appropriate/relevant?
   b. Did the planned activities contribute toward accomplishing the goals?
   c. Who should be included as participants?

3. To aid in projecting the Institute's role and direction:

   a. Is there a need for an Institute such as this with these given objectives?

   b. What could be the role of an Institute such as this in relation to other Asian-American educational interest groups?

Design of the Evaluation

The design of the evaluation and evaluation instruments was a joint effort by the three members of the evaluation committee which included Mark Chow, Coordinator of the Institute; Amefil Agbayani, a participant this year who will be coordinating the Institute in Hawaii next year; and Patricia Yee, another participant.

There were three opportunities to gather evaluation data. Once at the beginning of the Institute and twice at the end. For the first two times, questionnaires were distributed to the participants. The final time was a discussion among the participants, led by the Director of the Institute with some of the seminar leaders present. Given that the participants were quite familiar with the purposes and procedures of evaluations and, on the whole, were quite verbal and willing to volunteer information, it was decided that an open-ended format for the questionnaires, except where it would be expedient to use a check off question would be appropriate. Though a rating scale had been considered for the second questionnaire, it was decided that soliciting comments would allow for more constructive suggestions which is one of the primary purposes of the evaluation. A copy of the questionnaires can be found in Appendix B.

The first questionnaire was distributed to each participant present at the first coffee hour, which was the first of the regular, planned activities of the Institute. The questionnaire consisted of two questions. The important one asked the participants to state two or three objectives or goals they wished to meet by attending the Institute. The intent was to see if the goals of the Institute and that of the participants were congruent. That is, from the personal perspectives of each participant was the Institute's objectives appropriate/relevant? If not, this would probably affect participants' perception of the Institute, what they would/would not benefit from in the two weeks, and how they would evaluate the Institute.

The second question regarding comments/suggestions about the facilities, schedule, topics, and activities, was designed to give participants an opportunity to express any difficulties that they had experienced or anticipated so that the Director and/or his staff could be of help in resolving. It turned out that the Director and his staff were very flexible and helpful regarding any of the circumstances over which they could control or influence as evidenced by some of the appreciative comments on the final questionnaire.

The second questionnaire was distributed to all participants present at the morning seminar on the second to the last day (the last full day of activities). Participants were asked to complete the three-page form and return it the next day during the closing session discussions. This was a more comprehensive questionnaire covering participant background, the fit between goals and the planned activities, and the effects of the Institute.

The closing session discussions were led by the Director of the Institute with two members of the evaluation committee taking notes and only minimally participating in the discussion. The discussions were wide ranging but centered primarily on the issues of the need for the Institute and the possible role of the Institute in relation to other Asian-American education organizations.

Findings of the Evaluation

The summary of the information gathered will take two forms. First, in this section the responses to the questionnaires will be summarized item by item in the order they appear. Then, in the next section entitled "Discussion of the Findings," the information will be discussed in terms of the guiding questions of the evaluation listed under "Purpose of the Evaluation."

The First Questionnaire. Twenty-one questionnaires were returned; the first two questions were completed on all questionnaires except one. Table 1 gives the breakdown of the responses to question one by objective and the ordinal position in which it was listed. Although participants were not asked to rank order of their responses, it may still be of interest to take note of it, realizing that the first item listed may often be the most important to the person responding.

The results in Table 1 show that participant objectives and the objectives of the Institute were almost identical. Of all the responses, only three did not match any of the Institute objectives. The objective to create a forum for the exchange of knowledge and discussion of challenging problems received the most mention. However, the development

Table 1

Participant Objectives/Goals for Attending Institute

Goal	Position Listed			Total
	First	Second	Third/Fourth	
a*	9	2	4	16
b*	4	10	3	17
c*	3	5	1	9
d*	5	1	3	9

*a: establish contacts, meet other Asian American researchers

b: discuss issues and be informed of current research

c: increase research skills

d: develop grantsmanship skills

of an informal network ran a close second and received over double the number of first place votes. To increase research skills and develop grantsmanship skills both received the same number of mentions, with development of grantsmanship skills receiving slightly more first place mentions than either creation of a forum or increasing research skills. This may indicate that many came with the primary expectation of meeting other Asian-American researchers and those working in the field of education with a primary concern for Asian-Americans. Also, the high proportion of first place mention for those interested in the development of grantsmanship skills may indicate a need for this among professionals in a certain aspect of research or who have reached a certain point in their profession where this becomes a valuable skill.

The Second Questionnaire. Twenty-nine questionnaires were completed; Table 2 is a tally of how many participants responded to each item. It is of interest to note that the two items which received the fewest responses, were item 10 and item 12 (fewer than even item 14 which was provided for additional comments). These were the two negatively phrased questions; "Which goals, activities, seminars might be improved or eliminated?" and "What for you was not worthwhile?" This is not to infer that these might be the only negative comments, but compared to item 11, which asks "What did you find most valuable?" These items received much fewer comments. In fact, the summary of item 12 will show that half of the comments actually stated that nothing was not worthwhile or that all aspects of the Institute were worthwhile. This gives a general indication of the overall favorable tone of the evaluation. Other indications include the many enthusiastic and positive

Table 2

Tally of Number of Responses for Each Item

N = 29

Item Number	Number of Responses	
1	29	
2	29	
3	28	
4	28	
5	26*	(*who responded to the questions as asked)
6	29	
7	24	
8.1)	23	
8.2)	27	
8.3)	29	
8.4)	25	
8.5)	26	
8.6)	25	
8.7)	28	
9	22	
10	18	
11	27	
12	18	
13	27	
14	21	

comments which were volunteered under Item 14, "Any additional comments, etc.," and item 13, the ways in which the participants' professional interest, concerns, or performance were affected by the Institute.

Table 3 is a summary of the biographic items on the questionnaire, items one to four. There were no particularly strong correlations between participants' background and how they responded to the other items. However, there was a slight tendency for participants with less research-oriented and particularly with less educational research background to want more interdisciplinary and cross-professional (including medical, counseling, and community based) representation and want to broaden the areas of concern to all Asian-American issues, not just education. Conversely, many of those who felt there was a good mix of academic disciplines and educational levels or made no comment on item seven were among those with educational and educational research background. As expected, participants' expertise in certain areas led to higher expectations from some of the seminars, lectures, and grantsmanship workshops; however, this did not always correlate with the number of years of education. There were among those who had already earned a doctorate those who felt that their horizons had been expanded, and those who had masters degrees who felt some courses were too introductory.

The next three items were concerned with participant recruitment. How did they learn about the Institute, what were the costs to them, and who else should be included in the Institute? The intent was to see what was the most effective means of reaching interested persons, how to minimize the obstacles for increased participation and towards which groups or disciplines to direct special recruitment efforts in the future.

Table 3

Summary of Respondents' Background

(Items 1 to 4)

N = 29

Item	Response	Number
1. Education:		
	Doctorate received over five years ago	7
	Doctorate received less than five years ago	4
	Doctoral candidates	15
	Masters	3
2. Academic Discipline:		
	Educational Psychology, Statistics, Measurement	7
	Curriculum and Instruction, Bilingual Education, Asian-American Studies	6
	Counseling Psychology	4
	Psychology	4
	Anthropology and Linguistics	3
	Political Science, Sociology	2
	Social Welfare	1
	Nursing Education	1
	Economics	1
3. Ethnic Background:		
	Chinese	15
	Japanese	5
	Filipino	4
	Mixed Heritage including Asian	3
	Korean	1
	Unidentified	1
4. Sex:		
	Male	12
	Female	16
	Unidentified	1

The responses for item five generally broke down into three categories:

1. Direct mailing of an announcement and/or application.
2. By word-of-mouth (over half was by someone associated with the Institute).
3. Indirect announcements which included posted announcements at participants' institution, bilingual newsletters, ethnic newspapers, etc.

Although it was not easy to classify some of the responses, below is a summary of the breakdown.

1. Direct Mail: 4
2. Personal Contacts: 11
3. Indirect Announcement: 11

The responses to item six are summarized in Table 4. Family responsibilities and financial sacrifices were the most significant problems facing the participants. The latter would have been an even greater problem if some of the participants had not been helped by the stipends. This was specifically mentioned by at least three other participants on their questionnaire. Thus, one major obstacle could be minimized if more funds were made available to participants, particularly if national rather than regional representation is desirable. The other problem of family responsibilities may possibly be linked with the length of the Institute; the longer the Institute, the greater will be these types of problems. This was a problem for proportionately more women than men, one-half and one-third, respectively.

Table 5 summarizes the responses to item seven. The comments fall into two major categories; one in which it was expressed that the combination of backgrounds was satisfactory, another in which specific

Table 4

Problem Factors for Participants' Decisions to Attend Institute

(Item 6)

Problem	Number of Responses
a. Family responsibilities	13
b. Career responsibilities	6
c. Financial sacrifices	13
d. Loss of vacation time	5
e. Loss of time for research	5
f. Other summer program offers	1
g. Other reasons:	
- Job conflict	1
- Not sure Institute would meet my needs and vice versa	2

Table 5

Summary of Other Disciplines or Groups
that Should be Encouraged to Attend the Institute

(Item 7)

Disciplines

- Communications
- Business
- Theology, Literature
- Computer technology
- Systems analysis
- History
- Cross-cultural Psychology
- Media
- Social Welfare

Professions

- Asian-American administrators
- Doctors, Dentists, Lawyers
- Practitioners (other than teachers) working in the field in various disciplines related to education or Asian-American issues
- Social workers
- Guidance counselors
- Agency representatives from private organizations who work for Asian-Americans

Ethnic Groups

- Pacific Islanders
- Indochinese
- Korean

Regional Representation

- Researchers and practitioners from East Coast and Midwest

None Other

- Related disciplines well represented
- Scope wide enough
- Good group and good combination
- Like make-up of Ph.D.'s and Ph.D. candidates

groups or disciplines were lacking. As noted, there was a slight tendency for educational research-oriented participants to comment in the former category.

Item eight asked the participants to evaluate the content and format for each of the Institute's activities in light of the goals of the Institute. A summary of the evaluation of each activity follows.

8.1 First Day Activities:

There were many positive comments regarding the first day activities. They centered on the opportunities to meet and mix with the other participants, especially during the wine and cheese reception. The orientation time was also thought to be helpful.

However, there were some who felt that the day's activities should have been more organized and substantive. It was felt that there was a lack of structured socializing activities to help in developing group rapport early in the Institute. Thus, the majority of the suggestions made reflect a desire to use the first day to become well acquainted with each other and each one's respective areas of interest. Some specific suggestions include more structured situations such as formal introductions and ice-breaking activities, less formal contexts such as a dinner party or a gathering at the dorm.

A couple of the suggestions dealt with the registration time. One asked that each instructor be allowed to give a brief presentation of the course for all the participants before they had to pick the course to register for; the other suggested that the registration time be condensed.

8.2 Coffee Hours:

A majority enjoyed the coffee hours for the following reasons:

1. The objectives to develop a network and create a forum for discussion were achieved through this discussion.
2. The topics were relevant.
3. Allowance for presentations from participants was given.
4. This activity tapped areas which none of the others did.
5. Both guest speakers and participant presentations were organized.

Some suggestions include:

1. Start later and stay on schedule; 9:00 a.m. is a better starting time.

2. Utilize participants even more; allow time to hear about participants' dissertations, research, etc.

3. Have less structure and more interaction.

4. Announce guest speakers' topics ahead of time so that questions can be prepared for interaction.

8.3 Seminars:

Language Seminar

Generally, this seminar was described as good. However, several of the participants mentioned that there were too many lecturers and as a result, the materials were not well-organized nor integrated. One participant suggested that using "advance" in the course title was misleading since the lectures were mostly introductory overviews.

Ethnography

Comments on this seminar ranged from "good" to "excellent!" Participants felt that:

1. The contents and activities were well organized and relevant.

2. The teaching method complemented the subject matter of the course.

3. The goal of increasing participants' research skills was met.

4. A good overview was given.

5. The instructor was personable and exciting.

Quantitative Methods

Many of the participants stated that this was a good seminar, providing thought provoking ideas and substantial data and exposure to important resources for future study. However, there were a couple of participants that felt some of the lectures were unorganized or too superficial and "fuzzy" with the data analysis. Some suggestions for format include:

1. More time for practice and discussion.

2. Better integration of materials by the three lecturers.

3. Better organization of handout materials so that they could be read before class.

Bilingual Research Methods

Some participants found this seminar helpful in various ways:

1. Useful for pre-disseration students in developing their proposal.

2. Helpful in developing the "right attitude" toward research in the Asian American area.

3. Helpful in learning about how to improve research.

4. Helpful in providing insights into bilingual educational issues.

Some difficulties mentioned include:

1. Too many methodological issues discussed at one time.

2. Contents not well integrated.

3. A need for a more systematic approach to discussion of issues.

4. A need for better prepared and critical discussants such as Ruby Takanishi.

8.4 Guest Lectures:

On the whole, participants enjoyed the lectures. They were described as inspirational, stimulating, informative, good opportunities for expanding one's academic horizons.

However, opinions on the selection of topics varied according to personal interest. Suggestions included:

1. Covering more disciplines, e.g., mental health and counseling.

2. Having more lectures on methodology rather than theory.

3. Using expertise of more of the Institute's participants.

4. Having more representation of entire behavioral science domain.

5. Addressing issues where research is needed.

6. Not duplicating seminar materials. Focusing more on general problems rather than focus on personal research.

7. Focusing more on general problems rather than focus on personal research.

Format and scheduling suggestions include:

1. More interaction between participants and lecturer.

2. Changing hour of lecture--3:00 p.m. is not a good hour for attentive participation especially after two seminars and a coffee hour speaker.

8.5 Granstmanship Workshop:

This was one area where previous background and level of expectations of participants had much to do with how worthwhile the course was. However, regardless of background or expectation, the participants thought the course was interesting and a good idea. Those having had little exposure thought the course was excellent, helpful, practical, well-organized, and worth squeezing into an already tight time schedule. Several made special mention of the good job by the instructor.

Suggestions and comments offered by the others include:

1. Addressing the development of research proposals as well as program proposals since many of the participants are researchers; an example would have been to use the NIE "Instructional Features" RFP with the August 10 deadline as a proposal project.

2. Covering more advanced techniques.

3. Allowing more time to develop proposals and receive feedback.

4. Spreading sessions over a longer period; too intense as it was given--many were very tired.

8.6 Interaction:

The overwhelming response was that the interaction was fruitful, rewarding, stimulating, and in general very good in accomplishing goals to develop an informal network and a forum to discuss issues. Several went so far as to say that this was one of the best, if not the best, features of the Institute. Suggestions included:

1. Making more time available for interaction.

2. More structured/organized time for interaction.

3. More interaction between staff and participants.

8.7 Facilities and Schedule:

The facilities were judged to be somewhat disappointing. There were complaints of lack of air conditioning in both the dorms and meeting rooms, and other inconveniences. One suggestion was to have

the eating facilities in the same building as the meeting rooms in order to save time and provide continuity if discussions were to extend over lunch.

Most of the participants felt that the scheduling was too tight. However, some thought it had to be this way given what the Institute wanted to accomplish. Others felt that perhaps this was too ambitious although all of the planned activities were interesting. What some of the participants would like to see the schedule allow for are:

1. More time to prepare for class and to pursuing related special interests.

2. More time for personal reading and writing.

3. More time to organize among the participants who had common interests.

4. More time to take in the sights at the site of the Institute (i.e., Boston University and Boston).

Items nine and ten gave participants an opportunity to address the Institute's goals as well as its activities. It was expected that there might be some overlap of these responses to those found in item eight; however, the responses to specific points asked in items nine and ten were desired.

9.0 Additional Goals and Activities/Seminars:

The suggestions for additional goals and activities/seminars were rather wide-ranging and perhaps can best be summarized under three of the Institute's objectives and an additional one which calls for the development of proposals or projects during the course of the Institute.

Under Encouragement of an Informal Network, the following suggestions can be grouped:

1. Applicants should send 3 x 5 picture accompanied by a biography which should be posted on a bulletin board at the Institute, or some time should be provided for this type of presentation.

2. A formal network of communication should be organized to keep participants in touch with the Institute and allow more opportunities for participation in follow-up events under this Institute's direction.

Under Creation of a Forum, the following suggestions can be grouped:

1. More opportunities for interactive exchanges.

2. Formal presentations by participants of their current and past research, disseration, proposal, etc.

3. Invitation to Asian-American researchers whose research interest are not on Asian-American issues.

4. More definitive focus on social aspects other than education, cutting across Asian-American life style.

5. Greater variety of subject areas for seminar/guest lectures

6. More Asian-American speakers on the topic of political cohesiveness with ethnic groups.

7. Announcement of services and organizations in local area of the Institute and time for those interested to visit those places in their respective areas of work.

8. More speakers from the local community--not just academicians.

Under Development of Research Skills, the following suggestions can can be grouped:

1. Address methodological problems specific to Asian-Americans in areas such as sample selection, measurement issues, and cross-cultural factors.

2. Discuss solutions as well as problems in research design and procedures.

3. Provide courses in cross-cultural research, methodology, cognitive development (post-Piaget), writing for publication, statistical methods.

4. Devote parts of seminars to basics, especially in economics and sociology, so that those without a background in these areas can also benefit.

Under Development of a Product, the following suggestions can be grouped:

1. Provide consultant time with some of Institute organizers on pressing proposal topics so that participants can pool resources and expertise to start writing.

2. Allow special interest groups to pursue in depth the drafting of proposals and formation of research groups.

3. Apply research and grantsmanship skills.

10.0 Improvement/Elimination of Goal Activities/Seminars:

Most responses to these items addressed the improvement or elimination of specific activities rather than goals. Among the suggestions are:

1. Grantsmanship:

   - separate from Institute "schedule wise"
   - extend skills

2. Coffee hours:

   - change to have participants presenting research and background

   - have it in the afternoon for flexibility, i.e., optional attendance

3. Seminars:

   - include a seminar designed specifically to exchange research ideas, critique other's work, develop research ideas

   - include topics which cover disciplines that participants represent

   - have bilingual seminar take a different approach or more varied format--perhaps more lecturing; review session in statistics on first day would be helpful as well as a free afternoon in second week for research discussion, planning, and writing for special focus pertaining to group interest

   - include two or three methodologies and then have lectures on various topics

   - include more diverse areas in quantitative methods

4. Afternoon lectures:

   - do not have seminar lecturers as guest lecturers as well

5. Interaction:

- allow one day sight-seeing tour
- have free afternoons
- include more large group social activities in the beginning

Among the activities that could be eliminated, several participants mentioned the coffee hour and afternoon lecture.

A couple of general suggestions are that there be some focus in specialized interest areas for those interested and provision for contact with first-year Institute participants, i.e., an alumni mailing list.

The next series of questions were designed to tap some of the intended and unintended outcomes of the Institute and any general problems which could not be addressed in the previous questions. Item 13 is of particular interest since this is the ultimate test of the success of this Institute--how, if at all, the participants were professionally affected by the Institute.

11.0 Most Valuable:

The statements regarding what was most valuable about the Institute can be clustered along the four original objectives of the Institute, each objective receiving many favorable comments. This tends to indicate that the Institute was quite successful in meeting its objectives.

Many appreciated the networking process, allowing them to meet other Asian-Americans on a professional as well as personal level in both formal and informal contexts including spontaneously organized social events. A by-product of this networking and interaction is the fostering of encouragement and confidence in one's ability in an area of research.

Also highly valued were the opportunities for the exchange of ideas and problems, for the exposure to bilingual issues, and for the interaction while working on research projects. The seminars and lectures were both forums for exploring challenging problems and opportunities for improving and expanding the participant research skills.

Finally, the grantsmanship workshop was mentioned quite a few times specifically as being the most valuable experience.

12.0 Not Worthwhile:

Of the 18 responses to this item, only nine commented on aspects of the Institute that were not worthwhile; the other nine either stated that there were no unworthwhile aspects or all aspects were worthwhile. Also, in contrast to the 27 responses pointing out valuable aspects of the Institute only nine pointed out some unworthwhile aspects, Again, this is a good indication that the Institute was fairly successful in benefiting the participants.

Some of the negative aspects mentioned included the following. A couple of the participants felt that the coffee hours were not worthwhile. More did not consider some of the afternoon lectures beneficial. Some felt some of the lectures were at introductory level, especially in the language acquisition seminar. One participant felt that personally, the grantsmanship workshop was too elementary. Another thought that the Institute should concentrate more on design and research techniques rather than theoretical issues from different disciplines.

13.0 Professionally Affected:

There was a noticeable absence of negative responses to this item. Rather, the comments were very enthusiastic and hopeful. Most comments can be categorized under one or more of the following headings which are illustrated by quotes from participant responses to give a flavor for each.

1. Opening up new areas of research/research methods

"Have gotten many new ideas, refined ideas, researchable ideas."

". . . I learned about naturalistic research and fit it tailor-made to my interests in Asian-American research and will use it in the classroom for student projects . . ."

"Have widened scope of research topics of interest and concern to my teaching areas."

"Has further inspired interest in other research areas I never considered before."

2. Receiving new motiviation, confidence or reinforcement for one's own research

"I became more confident, independent!"

"I'll do the same things, basically, but the Institute certainly motivated me to keep at it."

"It encouraged me very much to continue and to advance in the discipline of Asian-American (studies)."

"I'm very much encouraged by the fact that a group such as the Summer Institute participants have lots of talents and professionalism to support areas of research and interest and share concerns and strategies to deal with bilingual teaching and learning issues."

3. Developing a new concern for Asian-American issues

"I am now more concerned with Asian-American affairs and will direct some of my research effort toward the Asian-American population."

" . . . I'm now more than ever decided on focusing my research interests on Asian-American educational concerns."

"Has broadened my research interest to topics concerning Asian-Americans."

4. Developing a network

"Made good contacts with people interested in my research-professional field."

"Establishment of a very supportive community and network amongst fellow Asian-Americans provides a necessary base of information/help for me to rely upon in work."

" . . . I also wish to keep in contact with several people I met here who share similar aspirations and professional concerns."

Finally, in the spirit of the open-ended format of the questionnaire, Item 14 was provided for open-ended comments. Many used the opportunity to summarize their experiences in enthusiastic, superlative terms. For example:

"This has been a very valuable experience for me both personally and educationally. Thank you. I do hope to see you next year."

"I am thankful to have been part of the Institute. I hope to keep in touch with some of the participants and to make contributions to future institutes and research effort."

"Very good organization. It was a pleasant experience! Thank you."

"Attending the Institute was a very positive expe-ience both personally and professionally--truly unique!"

"Love the networking process!"

"One of the best experiences in my life!"

"Fascinating Group Dynamics."

"Great Institute!!"

Others, fewer in number, had some suggestions to make. Some of those not already mentioned in response to a previous item include the following:

"Spread out stipends across the board?? Some of us got pinched pretty hard. Mail and phone arrangements were inefficient."

"Summer Institute Echoes or Newsletter as a follow-up for expanding or extending the network concept of 1) pooled resources and information of ongoing research projects, 2) research proposals which need expertise involvement, and 3) job opportunities in teaching and research for Asian-Americans."

"At least one seminar should focus on how different disciplines view and analyze a common problem/issue."

Closing Discussion

This discussion, led by the Director of the Institute, was attended by a majority of the participants. Many different participants expressed their opinions so that the discussion could not be characterized as being dominated by a few only.

The discussion centered around aspects of the theme: "Where do we go from here?" Some addressed the issue of maintaining and continuing to develop the network; some on the agenda/format of the next Institute; some on the future role of the Institute, especially as it relates to other Asian-American educational interest groups--specifically NAAPAE and the newly formed AERA special interest group.

It was felt that it was important to maintain and continue to develop the network begun at the Institute. Suggestions included:

1. Organizing state-level networks and as a further step, developing cooperative proposals.

2. Establishing an Institute Newsletter or piggy-backing on an existing newsletter.

3. Establishing new areas of getting together or contacting past Institute participants and future ones.

4. Formally organizing the informal network at next year's Institute.

Concerning the next Institute, some of the points reiterated from the questionnaire and emphasized were that:

1. There should be more information about participants and more opportunities to utilize their expertise.

2. In addition to the seminars which provide basic training, the participants should be encouraged to work on a proposal or research project so that there is by the end of the Institute, a tangible product.

3. Some of the interactions among the participants should be structured into smaller groups based on common interests, such as academic discipline, ethnicity, methodological problems, etc.

4. More practitioners and community services people should be included.

Also, the Director offered some tentative ideas for the next Institute to which the group reacted. He suggested a four-week Institute divided into two two-week sessions. The first session would be a grantsmanship workshop during which participants would develop a proposal. The second session would consist of seminars. Two courses which he had in mind included a statistics course and a research project in which participants would have an opportunity to go out and collect data in

actual school settings. Most participants felt that they could not be available for a four-week Institute. There was also some doubt as to the profitibility of a statistics course which could be taken at any academic institution. Given the special nature and limited time of the Institute some felt that seminars should be geared to subjects which are of particular Asian-American interest and/or are difficult to find in most academic institutions. However, the research project idea was favorably received.

Finally, the goals and possible role of the Institute were discussed. There was a general consensus that the goals of this year's Institute were still valid and that perhaps two others could be included. They were that 1) tangible products in terms of proposals and research projects could be produced during the Institute and 2) job and career opportunities be made available and known through the Institute.

The possible role of the Institute was discussed in relationship to other Asian-American educational interest organizations such as NAAPAE and AERA Special Interest Group. It was brought out that the Institute was needed and important because it differed from the others in some of the following ways:

1. The Institute allows participants to be more actively involved whereas one tends to be more of a passive listener at conferences.

2. The Institute has an Asian-American focus whereas at educational conferences such as AERA and bilingual conferences very few Asians are present.

3. The length and structure of the Institute allows for more in depth interaction, including topic development and feedback.

4. The Institute allows for development and critique of budding dissertation proposals and professional consultation and exchange in a supportive atmosphere.

5. The Institute has more of a forum function rather than an advocacy purpose which some special interest groups do.

6. Whereas conferences tend not to have an interdisciplinary approach, the Institute allows participants in education-related disciplines such as economics, political science, anthropology, etc. to gain new perspectives in their disciplines and at the same time contribute to education in areas such as educational policy and methodology.

In addition to these ways in which the Institute differs from some of the other Asian-American educational interest organizations, it was suggested that the Institute could have a dissemination and clearinghouse function or could possibly be the research and training arm of NAAPAE. The advantages of the latter is that the two do seem to have complementary objectives, NAAPAE already an established and recognized organization. However, it was pointed out that NAAPAE has no staff as such to operationalize the concept, e.g., apply for a block grant and subcontract out for training, research, and clearing-house activities.

Though there were no specific conclusions, there did exist a unanimous consensus regarding the experienced benefit and great potential for the future of the Institute. Afterwards, some voiced the desire to write the next proposal for the continuation of the Institute after the summer of 1981.

Discussion of the Evaluation Findings

The discussion of the findings will be organized around the guiding questions listed in a previous section entitled, "Purposes of

the Evaluation." In a summary fashion, the significant outcomes, relevancy of the goals, activities, and background of the participants, and the role of the Institute will be discussed.

There were many encouraging indications that significant outcomes resulted from the Institute. A majority of the participants commented on the value of the various aspects of the Institute while very few found something unworthwhile about which to comment (see discussion of items 11 to 14). In addition, various of the objectives of the Institute were met for many participants. And, most significantly, many participants were affected professionally in terms of realizing potential new areas of research; receiving new motivation, confidence or reinforcement for their present research endeavors; developing a new concern for Asian-American issues; establishing a personal network and feeling a part of a supportive community of Asian-American professionals in education or an education-related discipline.

The goals of the Institute seem to be appropriate and relevant as they matched participant expectations in the first questionnaire given at the very beginning of the Institute and continued to be regarded as appropriate by the end of the Institute when discussed in the second questionnaire (item 10) and the closing session. The activities, on the whole, seemed to have contributed toward accomplishing the Institute's objectives. However, one overriding problem seems to have been too many activities attempted although all of them were thought to be beneficial. If it were necessary to eliminate an activity, the participants would probably opt to drop the afternoon lectures and as a second step

perhaps restructure the coffee hour to a later time with more contributions by participants concerning their own research or dissertation proposal.

Some specific suggestions for changes were given for the activities in items 8-11, such as the need for more integration in the format of the seminars which had more than one lecturer. However, many of the suggestions and comments from other items can be summed up in three encompassing ideas.

One, there seems to be the desire on the part of some participants to broaden the issues and topics of the Institute to all Asian-American issues, education being one of them and perhaps a central one. This may not have been a conscious idea among the participants but perhaps a natural outgrowth of the interdisciplinary background of the participants. The comments in item 7 for more practitioneers (other than teachers), social welfare and community services, medical, and legal representation tend to suggest this as well as some specific comments that Asian-American issues should be the focus of the Institute. Although there does appear to be a need to focus on Asian-American issues, it becomes a policy question as to the scope and focus of the Institute. Whether the emphasis be on Asian-American issues, educational research issues, or specifically Asian-American educational research issues, this may need to be clarified and amplified for future Institutes.

Two, there is a general theme running through the responses from item 8 on and that is there should have been more opportunities for active participation on the part of participants, especially in sharing

their ideas and areas of expertise. Many commented on the untapped resources among the group for lecture or coffee hour presentations, the desire for more time to meet and interact in special interest groups, and more interaction and consultation time with lecturers and special guests at the Institute. These are well-taken comments given the caliber and initiative of this particular group of participants which were quite apparent by the end of the Institute. However, in making this suggestion for future Institutes, several things need to be kept in mind. First of all, these comments were made with hindsight by a particular group which spent the most part of two weeks together congenially and found that there was still much to learn about one another. The next group of participants may not be as inclined. A case in point is that, according to the director of the Institute, much of this year's Institute's schedule and activities were based on last year's evaluation and experience. This year's group found new needs and suggestions to make. What is exactly appropriate for next year's group may be difficult to predict. However, two things do stand out as important in the planning: the application and screening process and flexibility in the structure of the Institute.

It has been the experience of the Institute that the backgrounds of the participants heavily influence the direction of the Institute. An example can be cited from the first Institute. According to the director, the first Institute accepted applicants from diverse backgrounds including classroom teachers and participants without some research background. This turned out to be a problem because they were

somewhat lost in some of the research and methodological discussions. As a result, it was decided, for the next Institute, to screen for participants with some research background and at least a masters level education with first priority for applicants in education and then education-related disciplines. This not only seemed to improve the situation but probably was helpful in promoting participant interaction and prompting suggestions for more time given to this type of activity. Thus, careful attention will need to be paid to the decisions regarding what the participant qualifications should be, who will receive grants to attend, what special efforts will be made to contact particular groups, and what channels of communication will be used for announcement of the Institute.

Also important in the planning is to realize the need for flexibility in scheduling and activity to accommodate spontaneous organization of interest groups and presentations. That is, the schedule should be set up so that it does not stifle or discourage spontaneity, but on the other hand it should not be planned around spontaneous participant interaction which may not materialize.

Finally, a third recurring idea through the second questionnaire and closing discussion was the suggestion for some tangible research projects or proposals to result from the Institute. It was felt that given the resources that the group had to offer and given the length of time of the Institute, that is was not only possible but a way of maximizing the benefits of the Institute to have some finished

cooperative products. The suggested structure for working on these projects or proposals varied. Some included individual effort, others group efforts. Some suggested organizing through the seminar, some through the grantsmanship workshop, and still others through independently-formed interest groups.

The closing session was devoted primarily to the discussion of the need for and future role of the Institute. Though many points were brought up in favor of the Institute's continuation, there were no specific conclusions as to the Institute's unique role in Asian-American educational research. There were, however, willing people to work on a proposal for continuation of the Institute after 1981. This was the optimistic note upon which the Institute closed.